

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the amendments and Remarks as set forth below.

Entry of Amendment

It is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered into the official file in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application into condition for allowance. The Examiner has previously indicated that independent claims 1 and 5 need to be more specific like the wherein clause of claims 12 and 13 in order to overcome the rejection. By way of the present Amendment, the Applicants have added a new wherein clause which is believed to make claims 1 and 5 allowable. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of Claims 12 and 13 as being allowable and the subject matter of claims 1 and 5 as being allowable if amended in a similar fashion to claims 12 and 13. Although

not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to also makes these claims allowable. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-15 are now in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the admitted prior art in view of Oh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,856,818). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated that one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Oh et al. with the admitted prior art to reasonably arrive at the claimed invention. The Examiner feels that it would be obvious that the channels could be spread out as taught by Oh et al. in the specific order.

By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 5 to make it clear that the result is that pairs of pixels of the same polarity are separated by a floating state of the opposite polarity and that adjacent pairs have opposite polarity. This is not described in the admitted prior art and is not shown in Oh et al. either. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this limitation would not be obvious over either of these references or their combination. Further, Applicants submit that this limitation makes it clear that the pixels are not merely spread out as suggested by Oh et al. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 5, as well as dependent claims 2-4, 7-11, 14 and 15 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong #40,953

EHC/RFG/njp
3430-0164P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000